

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-17, 19-20, 22-23, and 25-29 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claim 1 is amended. No new matter is added. Support for the claims can be found throughout the specification, including the original claims, and the drawings. Reconsideration in view of the above amendments and following remarks is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is thanked for the indication that claims 3-5, 7, 8, 11-17, 19, 20, 22, 23, and 25-29 are allowed, and that claim 2 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form, including all the limitation of the base claim and any intervening claim. However, for the reasons set forth below, claim 2 has not been rewritten in independent form at this time.

The Office Action rejected claims 1, 6, and 10 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Unger, U.S. Patent No. 5,526,854, in view of Zeligson, U.S. Patent No. 6,067,738. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

With respect to independent claim 1, Unger and Zeligson, taken alone or in combination, at least fail to disclose or suggest an external plate section removably coupled to the front surface of the outer case except for an area in which the dispenser is installed. As admitted by the Examiner, Unger fails to disclose an external plate section removably coupled to the front surface of the case. Zeligson teaches providing a clear plastic lens hingedly attached at one side to a refrigerator/freezer door. However, Zeligson does not disclose or suggest providing the lens except for an area in which a dispenser is installed. Further, Zeligson does not disclose or

Reply to Office Action dated October 18, 2006

or suggest the feature wherein at least both sides of the external plate section are removably coupled to the outer case.

Accordingly, the rejection of independent claim 1 over Unger and Zeligson should be withdrawn. Dependent claims 6 and 10, as well as objected to claim 2, are allowable over Unger and Zeligson at least for the reasons discussed above with respect to independent claim 1, from which they depend, as well as for their added features.

The Office Action rejected claims 9 and 24 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Unger, in view of Zeligson, and further in view of Lee, U.S. Patent No. 5,881,630. Claim 24 was canceled in the Reply filed August 2, 2006. The rejection is respectfully traversed in so far as it applies to claim 9.

Claim 9 is allowable over Unger and Zeligson at least for the reasons discussed above with respect to independent claim 1, from which it depends, as well as for its added features. Lee fails to overcome the deficiencies of Unger and Zeligson, as it is merely cited for allegedly teaching a guide bar. Accordingly, the rejection of claim 9 over Unger, Zeligson, and Lee should be withdrawn.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration and prompt allowance are earnestly solicited. If the Examiner believes that any additional changes would place the application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.


Serial No. **10/801,566**

Docket No. **IK-0086**

Reply to Office Action dated October 18, 2006

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this, concurrent and future replies, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 16-0607 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,  
FLESHNER & KIM, LLP



Carol L. Druzblek  
Registration No. 40,287

P.O. Box 221200  
Chantilly, Virginia 20153-1200  
(703) 766-3701 CLD/ kah

**Date: January 18, 2007**

**Please direct all correspondence to Customer Number 34610**